DOI:
10.1111/1467-8365.12386

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Embodying the Dead on Classical Attic Grave-Stelai

Michael Squire

I that grew from earth have become earth again.[1]

To tackle the theme of 'embodied objects' is to confront existential questions about life and death. Bodies bestow being. But they also circumscribe the limits of lived existence. The body conditions everything that humans subjectively think, feel and experience. But bodies are also ephemeral – fated to evaporate without trace. It is a destiny that we have grown good at forgetting, and even better (at least in the modern west) at putting out of sight. Yet our bodies are themselves transient objects: 'dust you are, and to dust you shall return.'

Unlike other living creatures, humans have cultivated ways to counteract, or at least delay, their impending demise. As a species, one of the reasons why people appropriate and create objects is to compensate for the failures of the flesh. The demise of the body – our inevitable *dis*embodiment, whether through earthly decomposition or fiery extinction – motivates gestures of material memorial, substitution and transformation.[2] From an anthropological perspective, the very loss of the body acts as an impetus for artistic creation: in Hans Belting's pithy formulation, funerary art 'makes a physical … *absence* visible

by transforming it into iconic presence'.[3]

My aim in this article is to probe ideas of embodied presence and absence in relation to one particular class of ancient funerary objects: Classical Attic grave-stelai, produced in Athens between the late fifth and late fourth centuries BCE.[4] These monuments, erected outside the city-walls of Athens (especially in the region of the Kerameikos), survive in large numbers):[5] placed around the inhumed bodies of the deceased, in collective family plots or *periboloi* (*plate 1*), they helped to establish a space for the dead in the world of the living.[6] Much has been written about the history of Classical grave monuments, and from a variety of iconographic, social and cultural historical viewpoints.[7] In this article, by contrast, I attempt a more 'embodied' approach, exploring how Attic stelai engaged with the parameters of the body as physical object: the strategies of visual figuration that Classical stelai enact, I suggest, play out the very paradoxes of the dead – seen but departed, figured but disembodied, present but absent.

The theme of 'embodied objects' proves a particularly rich framework for approaching this corpus. Situated above a family tomb, grave-stelai explore precisely the problem of transforming corporeal loss into physical presence: they give figurative form to questions about the ontology of the dead – that is, about what the deceased are, were and have ceased to be. By marking the site where bodies disintegrate and melt away, these objects

interrogate the promise and failure of manmade monuments to stand in for the deceased. On the one hand, they prompt reflection about the bodily conditions of sensing, perceiving and understanding death. On the other, they construct a space for getting to grips with the objecthood of the body itself. As erect marble object, the very shape of the stele could even be harnessed to suggest tentative bodily form. A stele in the Epigraphic Museum at Athens, inscribed with the name 'Hierokles', provides a pertinent opening example (*plate 2*):[8] in this case, various moulded elements transform the flat shaft into a semi-iconic, anthropomorphic structure – with empty Corinthian helmet for a head, upper rim for shoulders, rosettes for breast musculature,[9] shield for stomach and elongated loutrophoros vessel (complete with its own relief imagery) for legs.[10] In the face of bodily decay, the stony shaft stakes a claim to corporeal continuity: through its humanoid shape, the form of the stele takes on a mediatory role, at once substituting for the body of the dead and marking a point of contact with the bodies of the living.

This article can offer only a cursory treatment. I begin with some general comments about Greek attitudes towards the dead, before sketching the history of Attic funerary memorials and surveying Archaic monuments from the sixth century BCE. My analysis then homes in on some select Classical examples from the late fifth and fourth centuries, teasing out a number of

recurring tropes, and exploring their implications for contemplating the bodies of both the living and the dead. Fundamental, as we shall see, is what I call the 'interdimensional' space of relief, existing between three-dimensional plasticity and two-dimensional flat surface.[11] As present monuments to the absence of the deceased, Classical stelai frame the dead in an inherently ambiguous realm: as medium, relief situates the figural subjects in a representational field at once related to but removed from the bodily dimensions of the living. The final section brings together some of my arguments in connection with a later fourth-century monument from Kallithea (see *plate 18*). This case study makes for a fitting conclusion, I suggest, precisely because of its dimensional transformations of flat relief into architectural installation: the monument fleshes out – into three-dimensional space – the representational field of the stele itself.

Getting to Grips with the Dead

How did Greek thinkers conceptualize death? What were the dead perceived to be? And in what ways might the disembodied dead be perceived through the bodily senses of the living? Needless to say, these questions do not solicit single or straightforward answers: 'Greek' attitudes fluctuated, not least with time and place.[12] As so often, however, Homer provides a useful starting-point. The most relevant Homeric treatment

comes in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, known to ancient readers as the *Nekyia*.[13] In this book, which forms part of a larger inset narrative, Odysseus describes his visit to the 'house of Hades': audiences hear of Odysseus' encounters with former heroes and compatriots, doomed to the perpetual gloom of the 'Underworld'.

The Homeric *Nekyia* provides a key lesson in the virtuality of the deceased. Odysseus begins by describing the rituals for summoning up the dead: various spirits (*psychai*) are said to have appeared, hovering around the blood of two sacrificial rams. But the nature of these apparitions is wholly ambiguous. Although the *psychai* can certainly be seen and heard, they prove beyond Odysseus' literal and figurative grasp; while they hanker after the blood of Odysseus' sacrifice, they assume an appearance that is at once embodied and disembodied. The encounter with the hero's dead mother, Anticlea, sets up the thanatological stakes. After much weeping at the sight of Anticlea – who tells how she has died from grief, awaiting the return of her son – Odysseus tries three times to embrace the apparition (*eidôlon*). But three times the phantom slips through his fingers – 'like a shadow or even a dream' (σκιῇ εἴκελον ἠὲ καὶ ὀνείρῳ, *Odyssey* 11.207).[14] Anticlea's subsequent explanation offers the coldest of comforts: 'this is the appointed way with mortals when one dies', she explains, 'for the sinews no longer hold the flesh and bones together, but the strong might

of blazing fire destroys these, as soon as the life leaves the white bones, and the spirit, like a dream, flits away, and hovers to and fro.'[15]

As numerous commentators have noted, foremost among them Jean-Pierre Vernant, the *Nekyia* helped establish the parameters of subsequent attitudes towards the dead.[16] According to Homer, these spirits amount to elusive and illusory *eidôla*, or 'semblances'; if they are visually present, they are also physically insubstantial – objects that are bodi*less*, as it were, and hence resistant to tactile embrace. For Vernant, such apparitions also prove the ultimate 'doubles' (or, in Vernant's language, *simulacra*): in each case, the impression of iconic presence proves at odds with a physical absence – an otherworldly removal from the 'here and now'.[17] Later fifth- and fourth-century philosophers returned to this thinking. Among other examples, one might think of a passage in Plato's *Phaedo* (fourth century BCE): the shadowy *phantasmata* of *psychai*, Socrates explains to Cebes, produce visible images (*eidôla*) that can sometimes be seen around the tombs of the dead.[18]

For our immediate purposes, the point to emphasize about the Homeric *Nekyia* is slightly different. Here, right at the beginning of the Greek literary tradition, the dead are conceptualized in terms not just of their appearance, but also of their corporeal (non-)tangibility. If the bodies of the dead appear in one sense to be like those of the living, there is a fundamental

disconnect between the non-graspable forms that they assume and lived bodily experience. For Odysseus, it is the hand that serves as primary point of contact – not only between body and world, but also between human perception and those things beyond sensory and cognitive grasp: the story of Odysseus' interaction with Anticlea drives home the embodied conditions of human perception itself, pitching the resources of sensory sight and sound (the ability to *see* and *hear* these 'spirits') against more physical touchstones of bodily perception.

The Homeric *Nekyia* also sparked the imagination of ancient artists. Around the middle of the fifth century BCE, the episode is said to have been depicted in a famous mural painted by Polygnotus in the 'Lesche' (or 'club-house') of the Knidians at Delphi.[19] Although Polygnotus' mural is lost, the subject seems to have been reflected in contemporary Attic vase-painting. The best-known example comes on a pelike attributed to the 'Lykaon Painter' (*plate 3*).[20] At the centre of the pot, framed by palmette and meander pattern above and below, Odysseus is shown seated with a sword in his left hand; behind him, approaching from the right, is Hermes.[21] Most interesting of all is the apparition to the left. Juxtaposed against two sacrificed rams and clasping reeds that were originally added in white paint, a nude figure emerges from the black ground of the pot – and from the spiral patterns beneath its handles. The inscription identifies the character as 'Elpenor': according to

Homer, Elpenor was the first *psychê* to engage Odysseus in conversation, complaining that he had left his body unburied in the rush to leave the island of Circe (*Odyssey* 11.51–83). As Richard Neer has argued, however, the Lycaon Painter is at pains to distinguish the semblance of Elpenor from the other two figures on the vase.[22] In this case, the corporeal presence of Elpenor, emblazoned on the curving bodily 'belly' of the vase, is simultaneously underscored and denied. On the one hand, the figure is emphatically there: the muscular contortions of his body have been carefully delineated, and his outstretched arms occupy the vertical span of the vase.[23] On the other hand, Elpenor is rendered in distinctive three-quarter view; most importantly, he appears almost like a floating apparition, with his lower legs eclipsed by the extension of the ground below.[24] Taking his cue from the Homeric account, the Lykaon Painter here interrogates nothing less than the limits of painterly figuration: the paradoxical presence-cum-absence of Elpenor's ghostly semblance serves as a figure for the ontological paradoxes of mimetic representation itself.

The History of Attic Grave Monuments

The monuments erected over Attic tombs take up related themes. There have been isolated studies of Athenian funerary monuments from the eighth to the fourth centuries BCE: analyses, for example, of *ekphora* and *prothesis* scenes on Late

Geometric ceramic grave-markers (showing the funerary procession and laying-out of the body);[25] discussions of the rise of Archaic statues and reliefs in the sixth century, accompanied for the first time by naming inscriptions;[26] studies of how the war-dead were commemorated in fifth-century Athens,[27] as well as catalogues of contemporary funerary painted vases (above all white-ground lekythoi);[28] likewise, there have been various attempts to chart the rise and development of funerary stelai from the late fifth century onwards.[29] Somewhat surprisingly, there have been fewer attempts to tell a continuous history.[30] In most cases, art historical analysis has likewise tended to play a relatively minor role: as Robin Osborne put it, writing in this journal thirty years ago, 'scholarly treatments of death and burial in ancient Greece either ignore these visual images or employ them purely as illustrative material to back up generalisations and observations drawn from literary sources.'[31]

Before saying more here, it is important to be clear about the history of Attic grave monuments between the seventh and fourth centuries BCE. The use of marble monuments – both stelai and statues-in-the-round – was an innovation of the Archaic period: it can be traced back to the latter half of the seventh century, and continued until the beginning of the fifth. With the Persian Wars (490–478 BCE) such practices appear to have come to an abrupt end. The archaeological evidence (or rather lack of it) has been widely associated with a passage of

Cicero's *On the Laws*, written in the first century BCE.[32] Cicero mentions a series of legislative measures – so-called 'sumptuary laws' – that were designed to curtail expenditure on funerary commemoration: first, a decree in the first half of the sixth century, associated with Solon; second, a later law, specifying that 'no one should build a monument which required more than three days' work for ten men.' With marble monuments outlawed, fifth-century Athenians seem to have turned to a humbler medium: during the second and third quarters of the fifth century, the predominant object for funerary commemoration was the ceramic lekythos, most often painted with scenes of attending the tomb.

It is only later, from around 430 BCE onwards, that marble grave-monuments once again predominate in Athens. From the late fifth century onwards, the stele became the principal medium for marking graves, erected above family tomb-precincts, or *periboloi*, outside the walls of the city.[33] It remained so until the end of the fourth century – that is, until *c*. 317–316 BCE when, once more according to Cicero, Demetrius of Phaleron introduced a law that limited funerary expenditure to 'a small column no more than three cubits in height'.[34]

Throughout this history, funerary monuments can be seen to have devised different strategies for commemorating, monumentalizing and figuring the dead. In this article, my focus will be on Classical grave-monuments postdating *c*. 430 BCE.

But because these objects owe much to earlier traditions, I need to begin with their sixth- and earlier fifth-century antecedents.

As noted above, Archaic artists had recourse to both statues-in-the-round and stelai. Sometimes, sculpted stelai were favoured, carefully framing carved relief images. On other occasions, free-standing statues were erected over graves: these included seated figures, animals and equestrian statues, but they most often comprised standing statues of male and female youths – so-called kouroi and korai.

The dividing-lines between free-standing statues and sculpted reliefs were blurred. Often the bases of funerary kouroi framed their free-standing statues with relief imagery.[35] Likewise, relief-stelai could be combined with embodied sculptural elements – especially in the smiling sphinxes and other creatures that frequently crowned their upper register.[36] There are nonetheless important iconographic differences between Archaic funerary reliefs and free-standing statues.[37] Funerary kouroi depicted nude male subjects without additional elements (for example, *plate 4*).[38] Stelai, by contrast, could add additional characterizing attributes: often (though not always), the male subject is dressed, whether in a chiton or in military hoplite armour (for example, *plate 5*);[39] he is likewise often shown holding something – including a citizen-staff, a soldier's spear, a symposiast's cup or an athlete's oil-flask.[40] Where kouroi and korai are usually erected as single funerary

installations, the subjects of stelai could also have company – as, for instance, in the well-known 'Brother and Sister' stele in New York.[41]

Working alongside these differences in iconography is a difference in presentational mode – that is, with the manner in which Archaic stelai and free-standing statues themselves engaged with the body of their viewers. While statues occupy the three-dimensional space of the external beholder, the subjects of stelai are contained in the space of the relief: the lower horizontal plane provides a groundline and the vertical axis aligns with the erect body. Kouroi arrest the gaze of the onlooker: they confront viewers with a frontal encounter.[42] Stelai, by contrast, always show their subjects in profile: however hard viewers look, their gaze is not returned – the relationship between viewing subject and viewed object is one way.

Already in the Archaic world, then, we might talk of the 'containing' logic of the funerary stele. Additional compositional innovations could develop the idea, squeezing figures within the representational space that contains them.[43] It should also be noted that Archaic stelai sometimes combine multiple representational spaces, reserving a place beneath the feet for a self-standing additional relief – of a charioteer, for example, a horseman or a Gorgon (for example, *plate 6*).[44] In the case of the Gorgon – the mythical monster renowned for

turning onlookers to stone – the lower motif bestows the object with the very trope of frontality that the figure within the two-dimensional relief lacks.[45] As frontal subject, albeit carved in relief, the Gorgon might also be compared with the sphinxes and other creatures that frequently crown such objects: these plastic motifs are rendered in sculptural profile but with their head turned towards the viewer, thereby replicating the *en-face* encounter that defines the viewer's bodily interaction with kouroi and korai.

So what lay behind the choice of either a free-standing statue or relief stele in the Archaic world? Neer has recently suggested a political 'ideology of medium', developing an argument of Anna Maria D'Onofrio and others. If kouroi present the deceased in totalizing terms, Neer's thesis runs, stelai frame the subject in relation to civic values: 'where the nude, freestanding kouros is self-sufficient, comprehensible, and removed from the everyday world by his elevated base and his nudity, the clothed figure of a relief stele is thoroughly implicated in the everyday society of the polis.'[46]

Whether or not one subscribes to Neer's argument, it is the ontological difference between the two sorts of monument that strikes me as important. Kouroi and stelai both respond to a bodily absence: perched above the grave, they bestow a figurative presence upon the dead. But where statues bestow plastic embodiment, establishing a face-to-face encounter

between viewer and monument, stelai fashion a different sort of space, containing their depicted subject. Where kouroi and korai present a fully embodied three-dimensional statue, we might say, stelai are objects that *re*-present in a quite different way.

It is also important to note, already in the Archaic world, the inherent slippage between the commemorated dead and the objects that commemorate them. By this, I do not mean that either statues or stelai offered straightforward 'likenesses' of the dead: these are not 'portraits', and there is very little in the way of individualizing detail. According to the terminology that is often inscribed on these objects, both free-standing statues and stelai functioned as *mnêmata* and *sêmata*: as 'memorials' and 'signs', they mediate the memory of the deceased.[47] But the 'mediation' between material sign and deceased referent is deeply ambiguous. Take the epigram that was inscribed on the base of the so-called Phrasicleia kore, erected in the mid-sixth century BCE:

> *Sêma* of Phrasiclea: maiden shall I always be called, having received this name from the gods in place of marriage.[48]

As Jesper Svenbro has shown, the talk of 'signs' here is very much removed from the rational logic of modern semiology.[49] On the one hand, the statue is equated not with the dead maiden,

but with her *sêma*. On the other, the genitive reference to 'of Phrasicleia' (Φρασικλείας), functions in both an objective and subjective sense: the precise connection between 'sign' and 'Phrasicleia' is left unspecified. Perhaps most strikingly, the inscription proceeds to lend a voice to the statue – it makes the monument speak, substantiating it through spoken declamation. As viewers read out the words, they also find a shift in speaking voice – from neuter noun (*sêma*) to feminine subject and participle (*korê lachousa*), talking in the first-person (*keklêsomai*).[50] The inscription identifies the deceased and supplies some preliminary information about Phrasicleia – about who she is, was and will be. But it offers no straightforward answer about how these combined verbal and visual 'signs' relate to the absent body that they commemorate. Few Archaic objects better capture the entangled ties between the bodies of the living (who look on and lend voice) on the one hand, and the disembodied dead on the other (in this case, made present through the statue's own figurative stand-in): the installation at once constructs and problematizes an intercorporeal space for getting to grips with bodily loss.

The Interdimensional Space of Attic Funerary Stelai

The production of stelai and free-standing funerary sculpture came to an abrupt end in the Late Archaic period. From around 480 BCE, and continuing for around half a century, Attic grave-

markers became markedly less monumental affairs.[51] Of course, it was not that people were not dying or being buried. Rather, in the Kerameikos, as elsewhere, even the most lavish tombs appear to have consisted of low tumuli marked by undecorated marble slabs.[52] More extravagant burials were reserved for the war dead – above all, in the public *dêmosion sêma*.[53] In the case of private funerary commemorations, though, there is a shift from the medium of marble monuments to white-ground lekythoi, complete with painted scenes.[54]

The decisive change came some time in the third quarter of the fifth century. Shortly before or after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, there seems to have been a gradual return to marble monuments in Athens. Various reasons for this shift have been proposed. Some (following Martin Robertson) have explained the rise of these monuments in economic terms – as a means of employing the sculptors who had worked on the Athenian Acropolis.[55] Others (following Werner Fuchs) have connected it to the devastating outbreak of plague in the early 420s BCE.[56] Additional explanations have sought to explain the emergence of new iconographic forms: late fifth-century grave-monuments have sometimes been associated with Periclean citizenship laws and revised definitions of the civic family, for example, especially given the prominent role of women;[57] alternatively, the depicted subjects have been thought to materialize a new kind of political nostalgia (‘dissatisfaction

with, or nonconformity to, *democratic* norms', as Richard Neer puts it).[58]

However one explains the return to marble materials, it is important to emphasize that Classical funerary monuments are dominated by the medium of relief. Sculpted vessels – lekythoi and leutrophoroi (most often complete with shallow figurative reliefs) – are introduced towards the end of the fifth century,[59] and sculpted animals and mythical beasts were sometimes favoured in the fourth.[60] But throughout the late fifth and fourth centuries, there is no evidence of free-standing funerary statues being used in the manner of Archaic kouroi and korai.

Almost 3,000 Classical stelai survive in the archaeological record. As so often, the first task of the Classical archaeologist has therefore been to catalogue and typologize – a project begun by Alexander Conze in the nineteenth century,[61] and more recently developed by Christoph Clairmont in the late twentieth.[62] Inevitably, some scholars have approached the materials with the aim of identifying workshops, hands and models.[63] Others have asked more sociological questions, following the pioneering approach of Johanees Bergemann, in his book *Demos und Thanatos*, published in 1997.[64] A variety of social historical approaches have ensued: about the representation of different social groups (citizens, metics, slaves), for example;[65] about social constructions of gender (focusing on women above all, given the proliferation of female

subjects);[66] and about gesture, hairstyles, costumes, attributes and distinctions between 'public' and 'private' life.[67]

In what follows, my intention is not to overturn such approaches. By looking carefully at the form and composition of Classical grave-stelai, however, this article explores the bodily work that they perform – that is, the ways in which they bestow corporeal presence, and how those depicted forms relate to the bodies of the living. Through their games with the interdimensional medium of relief, I suggest, grave-stelai ground their depicted subjects in an ambiguous sort of bodily realm: they at once construct and deconstruct boundaries between the three-dimensional material object on the one hand, and the representational realm of relief on the other.

Despite the chronological and stylistic disparity, this observation brings us back to Archaic stelai.[68] The connections are easiest to see by comparing a Classical relief from *c*. 430 BCE – commemorating a certain 'Eupheros' (*plate 7*) – with Archaic predecessors (see *plate 5* and *plate 6*).[69] The Archaic and Classical reliefs both show their male subject side-on – following a horizontal groundline and looking from left to right. But there is also a fundamental difference. Where the Archaic stelai situate their figures within a two-dimensional space, premised on the profile, the Classical stele has begun to open up a spatial recession. In the case of the Eupheros monument, the trope is played out through the tentative suggestion of an

architectural structure (complete with incised pediment above): between the front and rear of the solid slab, viewers are asked to imagine an extension of the virtual plane, stretching perpendicular to the block's surface. As a result, it is the three-quarter view that predominates: the subject is portrayed between three-dimensional plasticity and flat depiction.

Additional attributes could be used to develop the impression of spatial depth. Consider, for instance, the rendering of two shields on a stele commemorating Erasippos and Meixias (*plate 8*). One shield is shown from the back (so that viewers might almost imagine its convex front protruding out from the back of the relief), the other from the front; note, too, how the shield at the right is rendered at an angle to the frontal plane, with its foreshortened side merging into the vertical axis of the block.[70] Such layering of space finds numerous parallels. The best known example is the stele of Chairedemos and Lykeas, again showing two male subjects bearing shields (*plate 9*).[71] Quite apart from the juxtaposition of body types (each turned to a different angle), observe how the two shields are once again used to enact a spatial recession. To the right, the back of Lykeas's rounded shield can be seen, held between the fingers: as on the Erasippos and Meixias stele, the object might be imagined as receding beyond the back of the block, just as, behind the figure's right leg, Lykeas' left ankle dissolves into the marble slab. To the left – which is to say 'in front' of Lykeas

– we see the projecting shield of Chairedemos, which in turn accentuates his rounded, statuesque body, modelled after the studied contrapposto of Polyclitus' *Doryphoros*.[72] In this case, the whole composition amounts to a study in the layering of space: the flat relief provides the backdrop from which the overlapping figures emerge – only to insist upon their embodied plasticity. By extension, the visual 'quotation' of sculptural precedent effectively likens the deceased to a statue, alluding to a three-dimensional bodily form within the two-dimensional realm of relief.

Unlike the monument of Erasippos and Meixias, the Chairedemos and Lykeas stele is forged from a plain, rectangular block – complete with moulding at the top, but lacking a more elaborate frame.[73] By the end of the fifth century, however, the majority of Attic monuments were rendered as make-believe buildings: the marble block takes on the role of a small temple or *naiskos*, with *antae* to the sides and entablature and pediment above.[74] The space between framed relief and pediment yields a space for inscriptions – a site for recording the name of the deceased, and occasionally more elaborate epigrams.

Such *naiskos*-frames find parallels in other sorts of contemporary objects – in Attic state-decrees, for examples, and votive-reliefs. And yet, in the context of monuments erected in funerary *peribolo*i, this framing device strikes me as especially

important: the surrounds of the monument raise questions about the limits of the representational field – that is, about how to contain the figured bodies of the dead within the material confines of the manufactured object. The architectural frame serves to ground the relief-imagery within a three-dimensional monument. As we inspect the figurative imagery, however, the boundaries between containing object and contained representational field are challenged or negated.

Almost as soon as the *naiskos* was introduced as framing device, it was also integrated within the pictorial field of the relief, forming part of the scene depicted. The stele of Agetor provides an early example (*plate 10*):[75] to the right, an arm projects over the side of the architectural frame; to the left, the pilaster provides a space for hanging the drapery of the nude figure. Here, as on so many stelai, we see figures that at once overlay, break and exceed the frame of the material object: a warrior whose helmet overlaps the upper entablature with its plume;[76] a boxer whose feet reach beyond the horizontal groundline (*plate 11*) and whose right elbow and left hand extend beyond the pilasters (as though he were about to punch the framing architectural surrounds);[77] a young hunter holding a hare and stick which both, like the dog at his feet, project beyond/in front of the sides of the building (*plate 12*).[78] In all of these examples, the frame circumscribes a space for figuring the

bodies of the dead, even as the represented figures are also shown to elude such containment.[79]

The porousness of the frame is particularly prominent when it comes to seated figures.[80] This motif – centred around a male or female subject seated on a stool or chair – made for a favourite composition of Classical *naiskos*-stelai, and is frequently appropriated in so-called *Bildfeldstelen* (that is, stelai with shallow recessed panels in low relief).[81] In such scenes, the chair on which the figure sits usually aligns with the vertical axis of the stele, overlapping the pilasters to the side; the seated figure is consequently made to project outwards from the relief. The Ampharete stele provides a well-known example (*plate 13*):[82] like Ampharete's left foot, the chair on which the figure sits is situated in front of the architectural frame. As if to underscore the spatial play, Ampharete's foreshortened right arm emerges from the left-hand side of the frame; the extremities of her body appear to extend out from the erect object, only then to stretch back into its central representational field.

If seated figures challenge the edges of the representational field – the boundaries that frames are designed to enforce – they also enact a rescaling of relief-space, in turn raising questions about the bodies depicted. Just as the chair or stool is made to project beyond the architectural boundary, the motif of being seated challenges the containing logic of the

frame: the seated figure threatens to break the physical parameters of the object by standing up. Similar compositions can be found in other contemporary reliefs: in the context of votive reliefs and temple friezes, for example, the device was used to distinguish superhuman gods from mortals.[83] The trope might remind us of Pheidias' seated statue of Zeus – this time envisaged not in relief, but realized as chryselephantine sculpture in his physical temple at Olympia: if Zeus were to stand up, as Strabo famously put it, the statue would bring down the whole architectural structure.[84] In the case of funerary stelai, the seated figure, rather than the gods, interrogates the containability of the dead. Yet there is an underlying analogy in how both sets of objects probe the body as object: figured within the relief, the seated subject both can and cannot be fitted within the confines of the material monument; just as the relief contains the body of its figured subject while hinting at its non-commensurability, suggesting that body also extends beyond the limits of the stele itself.

In all these examples, the medium of relief grounds the subject within a particular sort of space. Through the layering and artificial stretching of space, stelai bestow a semblance of presence. Yet the suggestion of embodied tangibility proves illusory: seen from the side, the marble block confronts the viewer with the rigid materiality of flat stone (*plate 14*).[85] The point takes us, I think, to the single most common motif on

Classical Attic stelai – namely the 'handshake', or *dexiôsis* (see, for example, *plate 8*, *plate 14*, *plate 15* and *plate 19*). The gesture has spurred a large bibliography: while it is often difficult to distinguish the deceased, scholars have argued, *dexiôsis* points to the reciprocal ties between the living and the dead.[86] The particular point I wish to emphasize is at once simpler and more complex. As an iconographic motif, *dexiôsis* envisages an assurance of tangible, corporeal engagement, portraying the contact between the living and the dead in fully embodied terms. In contrast to the Homeric *Nekyia*, in which the *eidôlon* of Anticlea slips through Odysseus' fingers, the act of *dexiôsis* depicts the prospect of bodily contact: it is the physical embrace of the hands – occupying as they do the outer limits of human corporeality – that provides the interface between the bodies of the living and the dead. And yet, importantly, such images are themselves contained within the representational frame of relief. As three-dimensional objects containing sculpted pictures, stelai exploit their medial form at once to promise and to deny an idea of bodily presence. The very way in which stelai were displayed – head on, from a distance, raised up in *periboloi* – drives home the point: as objects mediating between the living and the dead, stelai portray the prospect of physical engagement while themselves evading the sorts of bodily contact that they figure.

Dexiôsis was just one way in which Classical stelai could tease out themes of embodiment, substantiality and presence. Sometimes, as on a stele housed in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, we even find the handshake motif incorporated within a *mise-en-abyme* of figurative portrayals (*plate 15*).[87] In this example, a female subject is shown standing beside a loutrophoros vessel; the fragmentary inscription below the pediment identifies her as 'Hagno[strat]e', daughter of Theodotus. When viewers examine the imagery emblazoned on the loutrophoros, however, they find that the same name recurs: the vessel bears a shallow scene of *dexiôsis* between a man and a woman, and it labels the two figures as 'Hagnostrate' and 'Theodoros'.[88] As has already been noted, free-standing marble loutrophoroi were commonly deployed as grave-markers: they were sometimes used to signal the unmarried maidenhood of the deceased, and it is likely that such vessels once demarcated the boundaries of the *peribolos* in which this stele was erected.[89] Here, though, the sculpted form of a loutrophoros is nestled within the representational imagery of the stele: we see an image of Hagnostrate touching an object that itself depicts tactile contact. As multi-dimensional monument, the stele incorporates a spectrum of bodily representational strategies: the figurative presence of Hagnostrate, here shown encountering an object denoting corporeal demise or substitution, underscores a sense of bodily absence.[90]

These self-referential games with frame, tactility and replication go hand in hand with the dynamics of the gaze on Classical stelai, as discussed in a recent doctoral dissertation by Susanne Turner.[91] By definition, stelai are designed to be looked at. But just as they probe the sense of touch, stelai also thematize the act of viewing – as indeed the semblance of visual impressions. Particularly significant is the proliferation of scenes with mirrors (for example, *plate 16*).[92] In each example, a female subject is shown inspecting her reflected image – that is, in ancient Greek, her *eidôlon*. But the reliefs do not render those reflections plastically.[93] Importantly, the mirrors are usually also set at an angle to the relief plane, receding into the field of depicted representation. As Richard Neer has argued, the mirror consequently reflects a concern with simulation, virtuality and replication: artists hold out the 'promise of a fully realized "presentification" of the absent', all the while grounding it within the space of the mediating relief.[94] As empty surface, the surface of the mirror connects the internal look of the deceased figure with the embodied gaze of the external beholder. Ultimately, however, the mirror also speculates about bodily absence, denial or deficiency: incorporated within the representation, the attribute reflects the ontological paradoxes of the stele as commemorative object – that is, as something that bestows figurative appearance while underscoring the bodily remove of the dead.

Most often, the figures that Classical stelai portray are absorbed in their own representational world. Increasingly during the fourth century, however, subjects were sometimes made to look out, metaphorically breaking the frame by returning the stare of the external onlooker.[95] Few examples prove more poignant than the so-called 'Ilissos stele', probably dating to around 340 BCE (*plate 17*).[96] There is no tactile contact between the figures, and everything is suggestive of loss: to the left, a young boy grieves on the steps of a stepped funerary monument; to the right, an old man looks on with vacant stare; between them, a dog sniffs the ground below (introducing the embodied sense of not just seeing the dead, but also *smelling* their traces).[97] But what should viewers make of the bulky nude youth who dominates the composition? The external beholder here sees an embodied apparition that the internal viewers appear not to apprehend. We come face to face with a youth who is emphatically present – his body turned in three-quarter view, and his frontal head aligning with the plane of the relief. Within the representational space of the relief, this bodily figuration seems to be invisible. Yet for external viewers, peering into the frame of the object, the youth is shown to look out – and to meet their gaze head-on.[98]

Fleshing out the Relief

Such plays with space, tangibility and spectatorship are not the exclusive preserve of funerary stelai. As we have noted – with reference, for example, to the motif of the seated figure – there are parallels with other sorts of contemporary sculptural reliefs, not least state decrees and votives. By extension, the development of Classical relief sculpture can be related to a much longer history – whether one thinks of Alois Riegl's important distinction between 'haptic' and 'optic' modes, or of David Summer's pioneering cross-cultural study of *Real Spaces*.[99] The tropes analysed in this article certainly find counterparts in non-funerary contexts. In the case of funerary stelai, however, I have argued that the concern with embodiment takes on a special sort of thanatological dimension. As monuments that yield a space for figuring the dead, Classical Attic grave-stelai enact questions about the bodies – and bodily perceptiveness – of the dead: the virtuality of relief – existing between the pictorial and the sculptural – forges a space for grasping the paradoxical presence and absence of the dead.

With these themes in mind, I conclude with a final case study: the so-called 'Kallithea Monument', today housed in the Piraeus Museum, and towering at 8.3 metres in height (*plate 18*).[100] The monument was discovered exactly fifty years ago in 1968, outside a gateway in the Themistoclean 'Long Walls' that ran from Athens to the Piraeus.[101] In chronological terms, it was probably erected some time around 330 BCE, and hence

somewhat later than the other monuments discussed in this article.[102] Viewed against the backdrop of earlier materials, though, the Kallithea Monument can be seen to flesh out the representational space of relief, transforming the very form of the stele into a three-dimensional architectural structure.

The elements of the structure are easy enough to delineate. At the top is a *naiskos*, erected as a freestanding building: two prostyle Ionic columns support the entablature above.[103] Contained within the *naiskos* are three freestanding statues: from left to right – in descending height – are a *himation*-clad figure, a naked youth in *contrapposto* pose and a younger boy (with a red mantle draped around his left shoulder).[104] The monument achieves its colossal height through a series of marble platforms. The base consists of a tall, sloping podium, constructed from grey limestone. Above, with overhanging geison, is a marble frieze, portraying Amazons fighting Greeks, which in turn supports a stepped, multi-level *krepidôma*. While the stylobate (on which the two columns are mounted) is left undecorated, the other 'steps' receive additional adornment. Directly below the stylobate is an animal frieze of lions, griffins and bulls. Between the Amazonomachy and animal friezes, the lower platform bears a Greek inscription which associates the structure with Nikeratos and his son Polyxenos:

Nikeratos the Histrian, son of Polyidos; Polyxenos son of Nikeratos[105]

While naming the monument's honorands, the inscription also points to the geographical origins of the family: although buried outside the city-walls of Athens, Nikeratos is said to hail from Histria, on the Black Sea coast of modern-day Romania.

There is much to say about this installation, as indeed about its relationship to earlier Classical grave-markers. From the perspective of 'embodied objects', however, what interests me about the Kallithea Monument is its opening up of two-dimensional relief. The various tensions explored in Classical stelai – between surface and depth, flatness and plasticity, presence and absence – here take on a new literal and figurative dimension. If grave-stelai had been premised on the trope of containment – of situating the dead within an interdimensional realm – that make-believe architectural frame is now literalized as physical edifice. As a result, the very ground of the stele stretches open: the space within the *naiskos* is occupied not by figures in relief, but by freestanding statues that insist on their embodied three-dimensionality.

The Kallithea Monument is not alone in transforming the *naiskos* into a three-dimensional structure. It is possible to chart, especially during the fourth century BCE, a successive deepening of the stele frame, with the flush bodies of earlier

reliefs rendered as increasingly plastic figures.[106] Sometimes there is a recession of the architectural surrounds: in a monument dedicated to Thraseas and Evandria, for example, the *naiskos* has shifted firmly into the background, now serving as scenographic stage-set (*plate 19*).[107] At other times, the sides of the *naiskos* are made to project outwards, containing the figures in a self-contained structure:[108] consider the Diogeiton monument from Rhamnous, in which a female slave has been positioned between the Ionic column and side-wall to the left, driving home the three-dimensionality of the whole (*plate 20*).[109] The much-discussed stele of Aristonautes might be understood in related terms (*plate 21*).[110] If Aristonautes is here situated in a self-standing structure, he also emerges from the back wall of the stele: the angled shield that Aristonautes holds in his left hand has been turned so as simultaneously to project out of the frame and recede into the back of the monument; likewise, the folds of the cloak are plastically moulded to the right, but attached to the rear slab at the back, dissolving into relief.

The Kallithea Monument must be understood against this history of fleshing out relief. But it plays knowingly with the consequent reconfiguration of space, no less than the implications for approaching the embodied subjects commemorated. One might observe, for example, how the white Pentelic-marble statues are set against a backdrop of grey

Eleusinian marble, underscoring the distinction between figure and ground. No less interesting is the engagement with the framing function of the *naiskos*: while the sculpted bodies are all lined up behind the two prostyle columns, so as to be contained within the structure, note how the foot of the *himation*-clad figure stretches over the upper stylobate to the left.

Although the Kallithea Monument reconfigures the virtual space of relief, questions about embodiment remain. For all the plasticity of the three freestanding statues, they still elude the viewer's literal and figurative grasp. The three sculpted bodies may be sculpted to 'life-size' dimensions, aligned with the human scale of the beholder. By raising the statues to this monumental height, however, the installation proscribes more tactile modes of engagement: once again, viewers can see, but they cannot touch. In one sense, these statues offer a material substitute for the bodies of the dead, and in fully plastic form. In another sense, however, they also stand as knowing stand-ins, as remote from the viewer as they are from one another (hence the complete lack of bodily interaction between them).

No less intriguing are the sculpted panels that frame a view of the monument. As noted above, the crowning *naiskos* actualizes the representational space of the stele, turning it into three-dimensional reality, complete with freestanding statues within. But below the *naiskos* is a series of friezes carved in shallow relief. The inscribed text that occupies the middle

platform champions a frontal view. By contrast, the other two friezes – portraying an Amazonomachy below and an animal-frieze above[111] – run around the three sides of the monument. These sculpted subjects have often been associated with the 'eastern' ancestry of Nikeratos,[112] and the Amazonomachy scenes in particular have been connected with the reliefs that adorned the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus in mid-fourth century.[113] While these friezes certainly surround the monument with questions about cultural identity, they also encourage viewers to take up different vantage-points. As viewers walk around the monument, following each band of sculpted decoration, the statues within the *naiskos* themselves slip in and out of sight: questions about the bodies commemorated, in other words, are here mediated through the viewer's own embodied experiences of the monument.

Part of the explanation for an installation like the one at Kallithea must be social, economic and political. The monument is centred on the conspicuous display of wealth: from a cultural historical viewpoint, it speaks of shifting ideas about the individual and political collective, as well as about internal civic politics (what it might mean, in the case of the Kallithea Monument, to be a metic 'resident alien' in Athens – to be born in Histria, but to die in Attica). There can be no denying the relevance of social history to the corpus of Attic funerary monuments. As I have attempted to demonstrate, however, a

thanatological dimension is also at work. Embodied in the development of Classical Attic grave monuments are shifting ideas not just about the bodies of the living and the dead, but also about the entangled ways in which commemorative objects mediate between the two.

Notes

Research for this article was made possible by a generous Philip Leverhulme Prize from 2013 to 2016. The April 2015 *New Antiquity* workshop 'The embodied object in classical art' – hosted by the Department of Classics at Stanford University, and organized by Jennifer Trimble – provided an opportunity to discuss ideas with friends. A subsequent version of the paper was presented as the Margarethe Häcker-Vorlesung at the Universität Heidelberg in June 2016 ('Die Verkörperung des Verstorbenen in der Sepulkralkunst Athens: Zum spätklassischen Kallithea-Monument'). I am grateful to colleagues at the Heidelberg Zentrum für Altertumswissenschaft for their feedback, especially to Nikolaus Dietrich, Jonas Grethlein, Fernande Hölscher, Tonio Hölscher, Katharina Lorenz and Diamantis Panagiotopoulos. I also wish to thank Robin Osborne, Verity Platt, Milette Gaifman and the journal's anonymous readers for their generous suggestions, and Robert Pitt for his assistance with sourcing images.

[1] 'ἐκ γαίας βλαστὼν γαῖα πάλιν γέγονα'; *Inscriptiones Graecae* II², 7151 (London, British Museum: inv. 1816,0610.384): Attic stele of Aristocles, mid-fourth century BCE.

[2] Cf. the articles in this issue by Patrick Crowley and Jaś Elsner, discussing Roman sarcophagi – as well as the introduction (pp. XX–XX). Foundational is Hans Belting, 'Aus dem Schatten des Todes', in Contantin von Barloewen,

ed., *Der Tod in den Weltkulturen und Weltreligionen*, second edition, Frankfurt am Main, 2000: 'Das Rätsel, das schon die Leiche umgibt, ist folgerichtig auch zum Rätsel des Bildes geworden: es liegt in einer paradoxen *Abwesenheit*, die ebenso aus der *Anwesenheit der Leiche* wie aus dem *anwesenden Bild* spricht' (124). Other pertinent discussions include Jean Baudrillard, *L'échange symbolique et la mort*, Paris, 1976; Louis Marin, *Des pouvoirs de l'image*, Paris, 1993; Iris Därmann, *Tod und Bild: Eine phänomenologische Mediengeschichte*, Munich, 1995; and Jacques Derrida, 'By force of mourning', trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, *Critical Inquiry*, 22, 1996, 171–92.

[3] Hans Belting, *An Anthropology of Images: Picture, Medium, Body*, Princeton, NJ, 2011, 3 (italics original). The observation is fundamental to Belting's framework of 'Bildanthropologie': 'a *lost body* is exchanged for the *virtual body* of the image,' as Belting continues, 'here we grasp the roots of that very contradiction which will forever characterize images.'

[4] The most thorough catalogue is Christoph W. Clairmont, *Classical Attic Tombstones*, 7 vols, Kilchberg, 1993. In what follows, I use the standard abbreviation *CAT* to refer to Clairmont's catalogue: the first number, following the abbreviation, refers to the volume (with 'i' used for the separate introduction), the second refers to the individual 'tombstone'. On the 'special relationship' between art and death in Classical Athens, see now Nathan Arrington, *Ashes, Images and Memories: The Presence of the War Dead in Fifth-century Athens*, Oxford, 2015, esp. 239–74; and Nathaniel B. Jones, 'Phantasms and metonyms: The limits of representation in fifth-century Athens', *Art History*, 38, 2015, 814–37. As Jones argues, 'ancient Greek artists responded to death by producing a range of funerary objects – grave markers, grave goods, memorials to the dead – but … they also probed with great perspicacity death's significance for representational practice' (817).

[5] For the location of Athenian cemeteries in the Classical and Hellenistic

periods, see Donna Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*, London, 1971, 337, map 4; cf. Ian Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*, Cambridge, 1987, 222–33; and Johannes Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos: Untersuchungen zum Wertsystem der Polis im Spiegel der attischen Grabreliefs des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. und zur Funktion der gleichzeitigen Grabbauten*, Munich, 1997, 183–210.

[6] On the organization of *periboloi*, see Robert Garland, 'A first catalogue of Attic peribolos tombs', *Annual of the British School at Athens*, 77, 1982, 125–76; Wendy E. Closterman, 'Family ideology and family history: The function of funerary markers in Classical Attic peribolos tombs', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 111, 2007, 633–52; Janet B. Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV: Funerary Sculpture*, Princeton, NJ, 2013, 17–18 (with bibliographic survey); and Elena Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber (1000–300 v. Chr.)*, Berlin, 2015, 198–207.

[7] For the best scholarly overview, see Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 1–7. Also useful is Christoph W. Clairmont, 'Bilan historiographique sur les monuments funéraires attiques (1951–1997)', in Geneviève Hoffman, ed., *Les pierres de l'offrande: autour de l'œuvre de Christoph W. Clairmont*, Zurich, 2001, 15–18. For more detailed historiographical guides, see Bernhard Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, Darmstadt, 1983, 24–58; and *CAT* i.191–267. On the costs of monuments, see Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, 136–48; Graham Oliver, 'Athenian funerary monuments: Style, grandeur, and cost', in Graham Oliver, ed., *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, Liverpool, 2000, 59–80.

[8] *CAT* 2.882 (= Athens, Epigraphic Museum: inv. 13189): the name of Hieron, Hierokles' son, was subsequently added below. While the monument is in many ways exceptional, other stelai could incorporate helmets within their pediments (e.g. Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 876; cf. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 309).

[9] Such motifs are a standard embellishment of so-called Classical 'rosette

stelai': cf. Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 23.

[10] The vessel's relief-imagery mirrors that of another loutrophoros erected in the same *peribolos* (*CAT* 2.883). More generally on Greek art's recourse to armour to explore relationships between objects and bodies, see François Lissarrague, 'Transmission and memory: The arms of the heroes', in Elena Walter-Karydi, ed., *Myths, Texts, Images: Homeric Epics and Ancient Greek Art*, Athens, 2010, 191–207; 'Armure et ornement dans l'imagerie attique', in Nikolaus Dietrich and Michael J. Squire, eds, *Ornament and Figure in Graeco-Roman Art: Rethinking Visual Ontologies*, Berlin, 2018, XX–XX.

[11] My arguments here develop those of Richard T. Neer, *The Emergence of the Classical Style in Greek Sculpture*, Chicago, 2010, 182–214. Neer concentrates on stelai from the late fifth century BCE, demonstrating how they 'relate depicted space to the space of the beholder' (183). But where Neer argues 'that this "conquest of space" had a political charge', I seek to emphasize the thanatological dimension from an 'embodied' perspective: the spatial games, I suggest, go hand in hand with a funerary function and context.

[12] Important surveys include Kurtz and Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*; Emily Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Berkeley, CA, 1979; Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period*, Oxford, 1995; Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death*, second edition, London, 2001; Maria Serena Mirto, *Death in the Greek World: From Homer to the Classical Age*, trans. Annie M. Osborne, Norman, OK, 2012; and Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*.

[13] I pass over critical debates about the book's 'authenticity': cf. Alfred Heubek and Arie Hoekstra, eds, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 2, *Books IX–XVI*, Oxford, 1989, 75–116 (esp. 75–7). Pertinent discussions include Jan Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton, NJ, 1987, 73–80; Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death*, 66–92; Sarah Iles Johnston, *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in*

Ancient Greece, Berkeley, CA, 1999, 3–35; Lars Albinus, *The House of Hades: Studies in Greek Eschatology*, Aarhus, 2000, 67–81; Jan Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, London, 2002, 1–10.

[14] For the same trope, played out in the context of Achilles embracing the spirit of Patroclus, see *Iliad* 23.99–102: upon reaching out his hands, Achilles finds that the spirit 'went beneath the earth, like a vapour, gibbering faintly' (vv. 100–1: ψυχὴ δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἠΰτε καπνὸς | ᾤχετο τετριγυῖα). For the parallels, see Heubek and Hoekstra, eds, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 89.

[15] *Odyssey* 11.218–22: ἀλλ᾽ αὕτη δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνῃσιν· | οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν, | ἀλλὰ τὰ μέν τε πυρὸς κρατερὸν μένος αἰθομένοιο | δαμνᾷ, ἐπεί κε πρῶτα λίπῃ λεύκ᾽ ὀστέα θυμός, | ψυχὴ δ᾽ ἠύτ᾽ ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται. On the significance of the story for approaching Greek funerary imagery, see Jones, 'Phantasms and metonyms', 819–20; and Susanne Turner, 'Sight and death: Seeing the dead through ancient eyes', in Michael J. Squire, ed., *Sight and the Ancient Senses*, London, 2016, 143–60, at 144–5; compare also Verity J. Platt and Michael J. Squire, 'Getting to grips with classical art: Rethinking the haptics of Graeco-Roman visual culture', in A. Pappas, ed., *Touch and the Ancient Senses*, London, 2018, 75–104, at 82.

[16] Cf. Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, ed. Froma Zeitlin, Princeton, NJ, 1991, 164–85, esp. 167–8 (translating a French article first published in 1975). 'In their voices, words, gestures, and thoughts, these *eidōla* incarnate an actual presence that stands before the particular hero,' Vernant argues, but 'all they can embrace is empty and insubstantial air': 'it is this inclusion of a "being elsewhere" in the midst of "being here" that constitutes the archaic *eidōlon*, less an image in the sense in which we understand it today than a double' (168). On the 'otherworldliness' of such *eidôla*, cf. Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals*, 186–8; and Ruth Bardel, '*Eidôla* in epic, tragedy and vase-painting', in N. Keith Rutter and Brian A.

Sparkes, eds, *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 2000, 140–60, esp. 144–53.

[17] Additional myths returned to this thinking: foremost among them is the story of Orpheus and Eurydice (cf. Belting, 'Aus dem Schatten des Todes', 149–51); for the development of the myth and extant visual depictions, see *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (*LIMC*), 8 vols, Zurich, 1981–1999, vol. 4.1, 98–100.

[18] Plato, *Phaedo* 81c–d: on the relevance for approaching fifth-century white-ground lekythoi, see Jones, 'Phantasms and metonyms', esp. 825–6.

[19] The key testimony is Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 10.25.1–31.12: see Sascha Kansteiner, Klaus Hollof, Lauri Lehmann, Bernd Seidensticker and Klaus Stemmer, eds, *Der Neue Overbeck: Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, Berlin, 2014, 2.681–709, nos. 1476–82, along with the attempted reconstruction by Mark D. Stansbury O'Donnell, 'Polygnotus' *Nekyia*: A reconstruction and analysis', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 94, 1990, 213–35. Cf. Eliana Mugione, 'La lesche degli Cnidi a Delfi: proposta di rilettura del programma figurativo', in Isabella Colpo, Irene Favaretto and Francesca Ghedini, eds, *Immagini e immaginari dall'antichità classica al mondo moderno*, Padua, 2006, 197–213; and Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 159–63.

[20] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts: inv. 34.79 (= John D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, second edition, Oxford, 1963, 1045, no. 2; John D. Beazley, *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and to Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, Oxford, 1971, 444). The best discussion is Richard T. Neer, 'The lion's eye: Imitation and uncertainty in Attic red-figure', *Representations*, 51, 1995, 118–53, esp. 134–41. On the relationship with Polygnotus' painting, see Stansbury O'Donnell, 'Polygnotus' *Nekyia*', esp. 222 (with critique in Neer, 'The lion's eye', 151 n. 67). More generally on contemporary Attic 'Underworld' scenes, see Fassiliki Felten, *Attische Unterweltdarstellungen des VI. und V Jhs. v. Chr.*, Munich, 1975; cf. Walter-

Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 135–63.

[21] Hermes goes without mention in the Homeric account: cf. Neer, 'The lion's eye', 136–7. For other extant scenes of Elpenor, see *LIMC*, vol. 3.1, 721–2, s.v. 'Elpenor'.

[22] Cf. Neer, 'The lion's eye', 137–8: 'On the one hand, the Lykaon Painter has presented a supremely mimetic figure, using every trick in the book to assert its weight and presence. On the other, he has made it clear that the figure is nothing but a phantom, an illusion … The act of seeing thus finds itself inscribed into the image itself, such that the boundaries between life and art, reality and illusion – indeed, between ourselves as viewers and it as object – are once more confounded.'

[23] See also Robin Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Art*, Oxford, 1998, 169: 'Elpenor's is a Polykleitan body, and the Polykleitan body is shown up as an artist's fiction.'

[24] Cf. Neer, 'The lion's eye', 137: 'This figure, for whom the artist has pulled out all the stops, on whom he has bestowed an unprecedented sense of corporeality, is precisely the one least deserving of that honor: the single most insubstantial, incorporeal, shadowy, dreamlike figure one could possibly represent. And the viewer knows it. If this is mimesis, it is of a strange sort.'

[25] For an overview, see Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 19–48. On the figurative 'framing' of the dead on such vases, see also Verity J. Platt and Michael J. Squire, 'Framing the visual in Greek and Roman antiquity', in Verity J. Platt and Michael J. Squire, eds, *The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History*, Cambridge, 2007, 1–99, at 14–16.

[26] Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 49–123, provides a recent survey; key studies include Gisela M. A. Richter, *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, Cambridge, MA, 1944; J. Friis Johansen, *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period: An Interpretation*, Copenhagen, 1951, esp. 65–119; Lilian H. Jeffrey, 'The inscribed gravestones of Archaic Attica', *Annual of the*

British School at Athens, 57, 1962, 115–53; and Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, 149–89.

[27] Fundamental now is Arrington, *Ashes, Images and Memories*.

[28] On white-ground lekythoi as evidence for fifth-century ideas about death, see John H. Oakley, *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the White Lekythoi*, Cambridge, 2004; cf. also Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Art*, 189–95; Erika Kunze-Götte, 'Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsweise sepulkraler Thematik auf weißgrundigen Lekythen', in Stefan Schmidt and John H. Oakley, eds, *Hermeneutik der Bilder: Beiträge zu Ikonographie und Interpretation griechischer Vasenmalerei*, Munich, 2009, 53–64; Arrington, *Ashes, Images and Memories*, esp. 239–74; Jones, 'Phantasms and metonyms'.

[29] See Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 11–13 – and below, pp. XX–XX.

[30] The most important exceptions are Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death*; and Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*. Compare also Kurtz and Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*; Vermeule, *Aspects of Death*; Garland, *Greek Way of Death*.

[31] Robin Osborne, 'Death revisited, death revised: The death of the artist in Archaic and classical Greece', *Art History*, 11, 1988, 1–16, quotation from 1 (with further comments at 14–15).

[32] Cicero, *On the Laws* 2.64–5: cf. Ian Morris, 'Law, culture and funerary art in Athens, 600–300 B.C.', *Hephaistos*, 11–12, 1992–1993, 35–50; Nikolaus Himmelmann, *Attische Grabreliefs*, Wiesbaden, 1999, esp. 18–19; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 11.

[33] Cf. Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 11–13. On the different types of stele that survive in the archaeological record, see Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 19–23.

[34] Cicero, *On the Laws* 2.66: cf. Andreas Scholl, *Die attischen Bildfeldstelen des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den kleinformatigen Grabreliefs im*

spätklassischen Athen, Berlin, 1996, 26–9; Karen E. Stears, 'Losing the picture: Change and continuity in Athenian grave monuments in the fourth and third centuries BC', in N. Keith Rutter and Brian A. Sparkes, eds, *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 2000, 206–27, esp. 219–27; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 14–15 (with further bibliography).

[35] Cf. Angeliki Kosmopulou, *The Iconography of Sculpted Statue Bases in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Madison, WI, 2002, 43–63, with 164–74, nos. 7–12.

[36] On the appearance of the sphinx in Archaic reliefs, cf. Richter, *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, 19–21; cf. Johansen, *Attic Grave-Reliefs*, 88–93; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 59–63.

[37] Cf. e.g. Anna Maria d'Onofrio, 'Kouroi e stele: iconografia e ideologia del monumento funerario arcaico in Attica', *Annali dell'Istituto universitario orientali di Napoli*, 7, 1985, 201–4; Anna Maria d'Onofrio, 'Oikoi, généalogies et monuments: réflexions sur le système de dédicaces dans l'Attique archaïque', *Ktèma*, 23, 1998, 103–23; Robin Osborne, 'Death revisited', 6–9; Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 186–7; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, esp. 63–5.

[38] 'Croesus kouros': Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 3851. On the kouros and its inscription (Peter A. Hansen, ed., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols, Berlin, 1983–1989, vol. 1, 27), see Nikolaos E. Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens*, trans. David Hardy, Los Angeles, 2002, 58, no. 69 (with further bibliography).

[39] Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 29: Richter, *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, 99–100; Osborne, 'Death revisited', 8–9; Hans Wiegartz, 'Bemerkungen zur Aristion-Stele', *Boreas*, 19, 1996, 101–14. On the significance of the clothing, cf. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 91–4.

[40] Discus: e.g. Athens, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 38. Spear: e.g. Athens, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 7901. Athlete's oil-flask: e.g.

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 11.185; Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 1531. Staff: e.g. Athens, Kerameikos Museum, inv. P1132. Cup: e.g. Athens, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 30.

[41] On the stele – parts of which are in Berlin (Antikensammlung inv. 1531) and New York (Metropolitan Museum of Art: inv. 11.185) – see Johansen, *Attic Grave-Reliefs*, 97–8, and Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 27–8.

[42] On the frontality of the kouros, see in particular Jaś Elsner, 'Reflections on the Greek revolution in art: From changes in viewing to the transformation of subjectivity', in Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, eds, *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, 2006, 68–95.

[43] Consider the two warriors combined in a stele housed in Copenhagen (Ny Carslberg Glyptotek, inv. 2787; cf. Richter, *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, 103; Johansen, *Attic Grave-Reliefs*, 101–2): one warrior stands in profile, facing from right to left; the other is laid over him in a crouching position (with his knee submerged behind a profile shield that aligns with the relief's frontal plane).

[44] Charioteer: e.g. Johansen, *Attic Grave-Reliefs*, 98 (fig. 50: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art: inv. 36.11.13). Horseman: e.g. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 70 (fig. 35: Rome, Museo Barracco: inv. 74). Gorgon: Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum*, 51, no. 50 (Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 2687).

[45] On the frontal stare of the Gorgon, see Rainer Mack, 'Facing down Medusa (an aetiology of the gaze)', *Art History*, 25, 2002, 571–604; cf. Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals*, 111–38 (developed in *La mort dans les yeux: Figures de l'Autre en Grèce ancienne: Artémis, Gorgô*, Paris, 1998: esp. 31–8); Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, *Du masque au visage: aspects de l'identité en Grecè ancienne*, Paris, 1995, esp. 71–4; and Guy Hedreen, 'Involved spectatorship in Archaic Greek art', *Art History*, 30, 2006, 217–46.

[46] Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 187. Cf. above, n. XX.

[47] Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death*, esp. 140–7; Neer,

Emergence of the Classical Style, esp. 14–19.

[48] 'Σῆμα Φρασικλείας· | κόρη κεκλήσομαι | αἰεί, ἀντὶ γάμου | παρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο | λαχοῦσ' ὄνομα.' Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 4899: for further discussion, see the introduction to this special issue (with illustration at p. XX). The Phrasicleia epigram is catalogued in Lilian H. Jeffrey, 'The inscribed gravestones', 138–9, no. 46 (= Hansen, ed., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 1.24 – my presentation is based on Hansen's text, albeit with adapted orthography); for discussions, see e.g. Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd, Ithaca, NY, 1993, 8–25, esp. 13–14 and 18–19; Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton, NJ, 2001, esp. 255–9; Mary Stieber, *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*, Austin, TX, 2004, 140–78; Michael J. Squire, *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2009, 151–3.

[49] Svenbro, *Phrasikleia*, 26–43; cf. Squire, *Image and Text*, 151–3.

[50] For the ways in which Archaic funerary epigrams thematize presence and absence, not least through the trope of 'ventriloquist epigram', see Michael A. Tueller, *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*, Leuven, 2008, esp. 36–42 (with further bibliography); cf. e.g. Gjert Vestrheim, 'Voice in sepulchral epigrams: Some remarks on the use of first and second person in sepulchral epigrams, and a comparison with lyric poetry', in Manuel Baumback, Andrej Petrovic and Ivana Petrovic, eds, *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 2010, 61–78; and Timo Christian, *Gebildete Steine: Zur Rezeption literarischer Techniken in den Versinschriften seit dem Hellenismus*, Göttingen, 2015, esp. 28–45. In this case, the games of voice prove decisive: the very gesture of 'speaking' about the subject's 'fame' puns upon the Greek name 'Phrasi-cleia'.

[51] Cf. Donna Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*, London, 1971, 121–2; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 11.

[52] Cf. Kurtz and Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*, 123–7; Karen E. Stears, 'The times they are a'changing: Developments in fifth-century Athenian funerary monuments', in Graham J. Oliver, ed., *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History of and Society of Greece and Rome*, Liverpool, 2000, 25–58, esp. 31. On the mediations of such monuments in white-ground lekythoi, see Oakley, *Picturing Death*, 198–203.

[53] In addition to Arrington, *Ashes, Images and Memories*, see Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 164–97.

[54] See Jones, 'Phantasms and metonyms', along with Oakley, *Picturing Death*, 212–13. As Jones has argued, such scenes mobilize multiple means of mediating the dead – for example through depicted memorial stelai, figurative forms and occasionally winged 'stick-figures' (so-called *eidôla*).

[55] Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge, 1975, 364.

[56] Werner Fuchs, Review of T. Dohrn, *Attische Plastik vom Tode des Phidias bis zum Wirken der grossen Meister des 4. Jahrhunderts c. Chr.*, *Gnomon*, 33, 1961, 241–2; cf. Jon D. Mikalson, 'Religion and the plague in Athens, 431–423 BC', in Alan Lindley Boeghold, ed., *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday*, Durham, NC, 1984, 217–25, esp. 223–4; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 11–13.

[57] Cf. e.g. Robin Osborne, 'Law, the democratic citizen and the representation of women in Classical Athens', *Past & Present*, 155, 1996, 3–33.

[58] Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 188 (italics original).

[59] See Bernhard Schmaltz, *Untersuchungen zu den attischen Marmorlekythen*, Berlin, 1970; Gerit Kokula, *Marmorlutropheren*, Berlin, 1984; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 23–6.

[60] See Molpo Pologiorgi, 'Stiere und Löwen in der attischen Grabkunst', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Athenische Abteilung)*, 119, 2004, 239–58; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 344–56. Cf. more generally

Daphné Woysch-Méautis, *La représentation des animaux et des êtres fabuleux sur les monuments funéraires grecs de l'époque archaïque à la fin du 4e siècle av. J.-C.*, Lausanne, 1982.

[61] Alexander Conze, *Die Attischen Grabreliefs*, 4 vols, Berlin and Leipzig, 1892–1922 (listing 2,158 monuments).

[62] For Clairmont's pioneering catalogue of *Classical Attic Tombstones*, see above, n. XX. The most thorough database is hosted by Project Dyabola: http://www.dyabola.de/manuals/grabrel/de/grab_frm.htm (cf. Johannes Bergemann, 'Die Datenbank der attischen Grabreliefs: Ein neues Hilfsmittel für ikonographische und sozialgeschtliche Forschungen', in Geneviève Hoffman, ed., *Les pierres de l'offrande: autour de l'œuvre de Christophe W. Clairmont*, Zurich, 2001, 20–5). Numerous other classificatory works could be mentioned, among them Ursula Vedder, *Untersuchungen zur plastischen Ausstattungen attischer Grabanlagen des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.*, Frankfurt am Main, 1985.

[63] See especially Jiří Frel, *Les sculpteurs attiques anonymes, 430–300*, Prague, 1969, with e.g. Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, 123–36; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 3. Also important is Bernhard Schmaltz's later work, arguing that up to 25% of extant stelai were recut and modified in antiquity: Bernhard Schmaltz, 'Zur Wiederverwendung attischer Grabreliefs', in Hoffman, *Les pierres de l'offrande*, 44–51; Bernhard Schmaltz and Maria Salta, 'Zur Weiter- und Wiederverwendung attischer Grabreliefs klassicher Zeit', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts*, 118, 2003, 49–171.

[64] Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*.

[65] See e.g. Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, 131–50.

[66] See especially the work of Karen E. Stears (with further bibliography): e.g. Karen E. Stears, 'Dead women's society: Constructing female gender in classical Athenian funerary sculpture', in Nigel Spencer, ed., *Time, Tradition, and Society in Greek Archaeology: Bridging the 'Great Divide'*, London,

1995, 109–31; Stears, ‘The times they are a’changing’; Stears, ‘Losing the picture’; Stears, ‘Spinning women: Iconography and status in Athenian funerary sculpture’, in Hoffman, *Les pierres de l’offrande*, 107–14. Cf. Osborne, ‘Law, the democratic citizen and the representation of women’; Ruth Leader, ‘In death not divided: Gender, family, and state on classical Athenian grave stelai’, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 101, 1997, 683–99; John G. Younger, ‘Women in relief: “Double consciousness” in Classical Attic tombstones’, in Nancy S. Rabinowitz and Lisa Auanger, eds, *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*, Austin, TX, 2002, 167–210; Diana Burton, ‘Public memorials, private virtues: Women on classical Athenian grave monuments’, *Mortality*, 8, 2003, 20–35; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 29–40 (with scholarly overview).

[67] For a recent survey, see Robin Osborne, *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body*, Cambridge, 2011, 65–75. Cf. Grossman, *The Athenian Agora XXXV*, 29–52.

[68] One of the most striking aspects of Classical stelai from *c*. 430–420 BCE is their referential play with Late Archaic traditions, as brilliantly demonstrated by Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 182–214: see in particular Neer’s discussion of the famous ‘Cat stele’ at 200–4 (Athens, Archaeological Museum: inv. 715: *CAT* 1.550).

[69] Athens, Kerameikos Museum: inv. P1169 (*CAT* 1.081); cf. e.g. Susanne Turner, ‘In cold blood: Dead athletes in Classical Athens’, *World Archaeology*, 44: 2, 2012, 217–33, at 226–9; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 233–4. On the relationship with Archaic precedents, see Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*,188–90.

[70] Paris, Louvre: inv. MA 3063 (*CAT* 2.155).

[71] Athens, Piraeus Museum: inv. 385 (*CAT* 2.156); cf. Rastko Vasić, ‘Das Grabrelief des Chairedemos und Lykeas im Piräusmuseum’, *Antike Kunst*, 19, 1976, 24–9; Jens Daehner, ‘Grenzen der Nacktheit: Studien zum nackten

männlichen Körper in der griechischen Plastik des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 120, 2005, 155–300, at 202–6. On the various ways in which 'flatness and depth, free-standing and relief, are mutually implicated' within the relief, see Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 192–3: 'it is as if the two formats of the Archaic period – kouros and stele – have been compressed into a single panel.' Cf. also Arrington, *Ashes, Images and Memories*, 221–3.

[72] Cf. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 304–6. More generally on sculptural quotation in Classical Attic grave monuments, cf. Nikolaus Himmelmann-Wildschütz, 'Quotations of images of gods and heroes on Attic grave reliefs of the Late Classical period', in Gocha R. Tsetshladze, Jonathan N.W. Prag and Anthony M. Snodgraass, eds, *Periplous: Papers on Classical Art and Archaeology Presented to Sir John Boardman*, London, 2000, 136–44.

[73] Richard T. Neer, *Art and Archaeology of the Greek World: A New History, c. 2500–c. 150 BCE*, London, 2012, 193, suggests that 'an architectural frame, attached by metal clamps, originally surrounded' the stele: there are dowel holes (one of which still preserves traces of bronze filling), but Clairmont deems it 'unlikely that the slab was framed' (*CAT* 2.156).

[74] On the origins of such architectural framing devices and their relationship with other sorts of Classical reliefs, see Katarzyna Hagemajer Allen, 'Becoming the "other": Attitudes and practices at Attic cemeteries', in Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, eds, *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, Cambridge, 2003, 207–37, esp. 213–15.

[75] Athens, Piraeus Museum: inv. 13 (*CAT* 1.221); cf. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 234.

[76] Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 3379 (*CAT* 3.171).

[77] Bucharest, National Museum, no inventory (*CAT* 1.302).

[78] The two fragments are housed in Basel (Antikensammlung und Sammlung Ludwig: inv. BS 233) and Brauron (inv. BE 812): *CAT* 1.289.

[79] It is worth adding here that stelai occasionally also incorporated manmade images, held within the hands of their depicted subjects: sometimes, for example, figures are shown gazing at masks (e.g. *CAT* 1.075, 1.400); still more intriguing is the incorporation of dolls (e.g. *CAT* 1.311, 312, 367, 757). In all of these objects, lifeless, figurative forms are sculpted within the relief, pushing at the associations between bodies, corpses and objects.

[80] Examples of seated male and female subjects are legion: for a concordance, see Johannes Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, 223–4.

[81] For the most detailed discussion of *Bildfelstelen*, see Scholl, *Die attischen Bildfeldstelen* (discussing the seated figure at 92–109); cf. Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, 181–2.

[82] Athens, Kerameikos Museum: inv. P 695/ I 221 (*CAT* 1.660). For the famous inscription (= Hansen, ed., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 1.89), see Christoph W. Clairmont, *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*, Mainz, 1970, 91–2, no. 23.

[83] As, for example, in the case of the seated gods on the eastern frieze of the Parthenon. On the seated figure and the visual theology of the frame in Classical votive reliefs, see Milette Gaifman, 'Framing divine bodies in Greek art', in Platt and Squire, *The Frame in Classical Art*, 392–424; cf. also Verity J. Platt, 'Framing the sacred: Introduction', in Platt and Squire, *The Frame in Classical Art*, 384–91.

[84] Strabo, *Geography* 8.3.30: 'he showed Zeus seated but almost touching the roof with his head, thus making the impression that if Zeus arose and stood erect he would unroof the temple' (καθήμενον ποιήσαντα, ἁπτόμενον δὲ σχεδόν τι τῇ κορυφῇ τῆς ὀροφῆς ὥστ' ἔμφασιν ποιεῖν, ἐὰν ὀρθὸς γένηται διαναστάς, ἀποστεγάσειν τὸν νεών). Cf. Verity J. Platt, *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*, Cambridge, 2011, 89–90; Gaifman, 'Framing divine bodies', esp. 392–401.

[85] Athens, Piraeus Museum: inv. 1201 (*CAT* 2.271).

[86] E.g. Glenys Davies, 'The significance of the handshake motif in Classical funerary art', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 89, 1985, 627–40; Elizabeth G. Pemberton, 'The dexiosis on Attic gravestones', *Mediterranean Archaeology*, 2, 1989, 45–50; Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, esp. 61–2; Christos Tsaglis, *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*, Berlin, 2008, esp. 188–90; Susanne Turner, 'Classical Attic Grave Stelai: Gender, Death and the Viewer', Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2009, esp. 92–4; Lucia Nováková and Monika Pagáčová, 'Dexiosis: A meaningful gesture of the Classical antiquity', *Iliria International Review*, 6, 2016, 207–22. On *dexiôsis* in *Bildfeldstelen*, cf. Scholl, *Die attischen Bildfeldstelen*, 164–7.

[87] Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 1863 (*CAT* 1.431). On related *mises-en-abyme* in Roman sarcophagi, see Elsner's article in this issue.

[88] The name 'Theodoros'– which is at once similar to but different from that of Hagnostrate's father, 'Theodotos' – has sparked much speculation (references in *CAT* 1.431). On the subsequent reworking of the loutrophoros, cf. Schmaltz and Salta, 'Zur Weiter- und Wiederverwendung', 79, no. 32.

[89] Cf. Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, 46–7.

[90] Bound up with this figurative *mise-en-scène* is a recession of replicative media. In the case of the loutrophoros, the marble medium of the stele aligns with the marmoreal object that it represents. By definition, vessels like *loutrophoroi* are intended to contain – they are designed for holding liquid offerings. Here, however, the container is itself contained within the marble stele. My own thinking here has learned greatly from Richard Neer, 'Ancient Greek vessels between sea, earth and clouds', forthcoming.

[91] Turner, *Classical Attic Grave Stelai*.

[92] For a full list of Classical Attic stelai with mirrors – up to twenty-four in total, albeit many of them fragmentary – see Younger, 'Women in relief',

204 n. 71. For discussions, cf. Leader, ‘In death not divided’, 693; Younger, ‘Women in relief’, 183–5; Hélène Bectarte, ‘“Tenir un miroir” dans l’art funéraire grec antique’, in Lydie Bodiou, Dominique Frère and Véronique Mehl, eds, *L’expression des corps: gestes, attitudes, regards dans l’iconographie antique*, Rennes, 2006, 165–80; Turner, *Classical Attic Grave Stelai,* 150–9; Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 197–9; Verity J. Platt, ‘Likeness and likelihood in classical Greek art’, in Victoria Wohl, ed., *Probabilities, Hypotheticals and Counterfactuals in Ancient Greek Thought*, Cambridge, 2014, 185–207, esp. 195–7. The key analysis of mirror images in Greek art remains Lilian Balensiefen, *Die Bedeutung des Spiegelbildes als ikonographisches Motif in der antiken Kunst*, Tübingen, 1990; cf. also Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux and Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Dans l’œil du miroir*, Paris, 1997; and Jonas Grethlein, ‘Sight and reflexivity: Theorizing vision in Greek vase-painting’, in Michael J. Squire, ed., *Sight and the Ancient Senses*, London, 2016, 85–106. Details about *plate 16*, illustrating a stele dedicated to Pausimache (Athens, National Museum: inv. 3694), can be found in *CAT* 1.283. An inscription accompanies the Pausimache stele (cf. Clairmont, *Gravestone and Epigram*, 77–9, no. 13; Tsaglis, *Inscribing Sorrow*, 155–7; Jon S. Bruss, ‘Ecphrasis in fits and starts? Down to 300 BC’, in Manuel Baumbach, Andrej Petrovic and Ivana Petrovic, eds, *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 2010, 385–402, esp. 400–1): the inscribed text draws out the visual thematics, declaring that ‘here [is] a memorial of your goodness and good sense for passers by *to see*’ (σῆ<ς> δ᾽ἀρετῆ<ς> μνημεῖον ὁρᾶν τόδε τοῖς παριο<ῦ>σιν σωφροσύνη<ς> τε).

[93] It cannot be ruled out, however, that painted details might sometimes have been added to the marble surface. On the use of paint in Classical grave-stelai, cf. Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs*, 71–101; Richard Posamentir, ‘Zur Wiedergewinnung und Bedeutung bemalter Grabstelen im klassischen Athen’, in Hoffman, *Les pierres de l’offrande*, 52–64, and *Bemalte attische Grabstelen klassischer Zeit*, Munich, 2006; Grossman, *The Athenian Agora*

XXXV, 27–8.

[94] Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 197–200 (quotation from 198).

[95] For some examples and general comments, see Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos*, 53–5; cf. Turner, *Classical Attic Grave Stelai*, esp. 114–39.

[96] Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 869 (*CAT* 2.950); cf. also Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum*, 193–4, no. 382 – along with Nikolaus Himmelmann-Wildschütz, *Studien zum Ilissos-Relief*, Munich, 1956. On the original framing of the stele, see the reconstruction in Johansen, *Attic Grave-Reliefs*, 23, fig. 9.

[97] For the motif of the sniffing dog, compare e.g. *CAT* 1.880 and 2.149.

[98] Cf. Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Art*, 199–201: 'Yet it is the figure of the young man that haunts the viewer, haunts because he is so emphatically present and yet insistently absent: everything, the boy, the dog, even the too-penetrating gaze of the elder, points to his not being there. But there he is, and not just there but with his eyes fixed on the viewer and demanding a response' (200).

[99] For a rich analysis, see Neer, *Emergence of the Classical Style*, 183–6, discussing the work of Alois Riegl (especially Alois Riegl, *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, trans. Jaqueline E. Jung, New York, 2004) and David Summers (David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, London, 2003), along with the important contributions of Adolph Hildebrand.

[100] For a longer discussion of the monument (= Athens, Piraeus Museum: inv. 2413–2529), with more detailed references, see Michael J. Squire, 'Framing the body: Introduction', in Platt and Squire, *The Frame in Classical Art*, 256–69. Although there is a brief description in George Steinhauer, *The Monuments and the Archaeological Museum of Piraeus*, trans. David Hardy, Athens, 1998, 83–4 (with pls. 24–6), and passing mention by Clairmont (e.g. *CAT* i.59), the monument still awaits full publication. Brief discussions include: Georges Daux, 'Chroniques des fouilles et découverts

archéologiques en Grèce en 1967', *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 92, 1968, 711–1136, at 749–53; P. M. Fraser, 'Archaeology in Greece, 1968–1969', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 89, 1969, 3–39, at 6; Elias K. Tsirivakos, 'Kallithea: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabung', *Ἀρχαιολογικὰ Ἀνάλεκτα ἐξ Ἀθηῶν*, 4, 1971, 108–10; Dimitrios U. Skilardi, 'An Athenian cemetery', *Archaeology*, 26, 1973, 54–7; Richard E. Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton, NJ, 1978, 258; Geoffrey B. Waywell, 'Mausolea in South-West Asia Minor', in *Yayla: Third Report of the Northern Society for Anatolian Archaeology*, 3, 1980, 4–11, at 5; Janos Fedak, *Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age: A Study of Selected Tombs from the Pre-Classical to the Early Imperial Era*, Toronto, 1990, 103–4; Brunilde S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture*, vol. 1, *The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.*, Madison, WI, 1990, 31–2; John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture: The Late Classical Period and Sculptures in Colonies and Overseas*, London, 1995, 117–18; Oliver, 'Athenian funerary monuments', 68; Allen, 'Becoming the "other"', esp. 210–11; Wilfred Geominy, 'The Daochos monument at Delphi: The style and setting of a family portrait in historic dress', in Peter Schultz and Ralf von den Hoff, eds, *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, Cambridge, 2007, 84–98, at 93–4; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 361–4; Olga Palagia, 'Commemorating the dead: Grave markers, tombs, and tomb paintings, 400–30 BCE', in Margaret M. Miles, ed., *A Companion to Greek Architecture*, Malden, 2016, 374–89, at 376. On the use of paint, see Posamentir, *Bemalte attische Grabstelen*, XX–XX, no. 88.

[101] On the location (within the ancient deme of Xipete), and other nearby monuments, see Garland, 'A first catalogue of Attic peribolos tombs', 158–60, esp. 158–9, no. L2 (along with the map of Dimitrios U. Skilardi, 'Ἀνασκαφή παρά τα μακρά τείχη και ή οἰνοχόη του Ταύρου', *L'Année Épigraphique*, 1975, 66–149, at 67, pl. 1).

[102] *Pace* e.g. Steven Lattimore, 'From Classical to Hellenistic art', in Konrad H. Hinzl, ed., *A Companion to the Classical Greek World*, Malden, MA,

2010, 456–79, at 478, there is no evidence that 'Demetrios of Phaleron's decree may have been immediately prompted by the erection of the Kallithea Monument.'

[103] Antefixes adorn the horizontal cornice block: Allen, 'Becoming the "other"', 211, argues that these suggest against a crowning pediment.

[104] On the body-types and parallels with other Classical grave monuments, see Sheila Dillon, *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture: Contexts, Subjects and Styles*, Cambridge, 2006. esp. 62–5.

[105] 'Νικήρατος Πολυίδο<υ> Ἰστριανός, Πολύξενος Νικηράτο<υ>'. For the text, see *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 24, 1969, 111, no. 258.

[106] For an introduction, see Stears, 'Losing the picture', esp. 207–10; cf. also Enzo Lippolis, 'Tipologie e significati del monumento funerario nella città ellenistica: lo sviluppo del naiskos', in Carmello G. Malacrino and Emanuela Sorbo, eds, *Architetti, architettura e città nel Mediterraneo antico*, Milan, 2007, 82–102.

[107] Berlin, Antikensammlung: inv. Sk 738 (*CAT* 3.419): note how the head of the male figure is layered over the architectural backdrop, just as his right foot stretches out to meet the frontal plane.

[108] Among countless examples, consider e.g. Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 737 (*CAT* 3.460; cf. also Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum*, 198, no. 394).

[109] For the installation, set up in Rhamnous, cf. Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 261–3, noting that 'in solchen Gruppen erreichen Plastizität und Isolisierung der Figuren in der attischen Grabplastik ihrer Höhepunkt' (263). On slaves as literal 'embodied objects', compare Bielfeldt's contribution to this special issue.

[110] Athens, National Archaeological Museum: inv. 738 (*CAT* 1.460; cf. Kaltsas, *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum*, 204–5, no. 410). One might also observe how Aristonautes is shown standing on an uneven

rocky ground: the marble medium of the representing stele doubles up as (imagined) real-life support.

[111] In the case of the animal frieze, the imagery also alludes to subjects that were sometimes sculpted as freestanding statues on top of Attic funerary monuments: cf. Squire, 'Framing the body', 256–69, esp. 264–5.

[112] Cf. *CAT* i.59: 'the magnificence of the heroon in Kallithea can only be understood in terms of its owners having come from a part of the world in which such heroa were not rare at all.'

[113] Cf. e.g. Geoffrey B. Waywell, *The Free-Standing Sculptures of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus in the British Museum*, London, 1978, 68; Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture*, vol. 1, 31–2; Boardman, *Greek Sculpture*, 117–181; Allen, 'Becoming the "other"', 211; Juliane Israel, 'Zum Grabmal von Kallithea: Kleinasiatische Bautraditionen im Spätklassischen Athen', in Katja Sporn, ed., *Griechische Grabbezirke klassischer Zeit: Normen und Regionalismus*, Munich, 2013, 55–68; Walter-Karydi, *Die Athener und ihre Gräber*, 364–5. More generally on the Mausoleum's influence on fourth-century grave monuments, see Claudia Lucchese, *Il mausoleo di Alicarnasso e i suoi maestri*, Rome, 2009, 87–93.